4

THE

NATURAL AFFECTIONS

NOT

HOLINESS.

AN ARTICLE FIRST PUBLISHED IN THE SPIRIT OF THE PILGRIMS.

BOSTON: PEIRCE & WILLIAMS.

1830.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2017 with funding from
This project is made possible by a grant from the Institute of Museum and Library Services as administered by the Pennsylvania Department of Education through the Office of Commonwealth Librari-

https://archive.org/details/naturalaffection00unse_0

THE

NATURAL AFFECTIONS NOT HOLINESS.

From an Address at the annual meeting of the Boston Sunday School Society, (Unitarian,) the following observations may be regarded as deserving particular attention. "Behold," exclaimed the speaker, "that hovel, through whose chinks the winter wind whistles. In its comfortless and single apartment, behold that wretched woman! See her wan cheek! It is a mother,—and on that miserable bed, her dying child! Its moan agonizes her heart. Hark! It asks for a drop of water to cool the raging fever; *but first, mother, kiss me.* The scene is over; the mother is childless; the spirit has gone to the throne of its Father; but it has gone *educated!* That mother, in her wretchedness and in her poverty, had yet opened a fountain of love in the heart of her child. It flowed in the desire for that caress; the fountain will flow forever; it is the water of life; it is the element of worship; it is heaven."* Here we are taught, that the *fond affection of a child for its mother*—an affection so tender and strong as to make it ask for a kiss on its dying bed, is the water of life, *the element of worship*—HEAVEN. If it is the element of worship, it is *holiness.* Heaven itself consists in the exercise of such affections!

Respecting Jefferson and Adams, we are told by their eulogists, "The apostles of liberty, the holy patriarchs of the revolution, have fulfilled their mission; and leaving the scene of their generous toil below, are gone above to receive their reward." Here *patriotism* seems to be presented as belonging to the element of worship—as a qualification to which heaven will, undoubtedly, be granted!

In opposition to these and similar statements, wherever found, I shall undertake to maintain the following position: *Such qualities as the domestic affections, patriotic attachments, and the feelings of humanity, do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian holiness.*

It is of importance, before discussing the subject in hand, that a *just definition of Christian holiness* should be given. *It consists in exercising towards God and man those affections of heart which the* DIVINE LAW *requires.* The standard of holiness

* American Journal of Education, 1829. p. 88.

is the law of God. No human quality is holy, which is not accordant with this standard. Now the apostle Paul assures us, that "*love* is the fulfilling of the law."* What objects this love must embrace, and in what degrees it must be exercised, in order to be obedience to God, our Saviour has informed us in the comprehensive summary to which he reduced the divine requirements. 'Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind; and thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself.'† Obedience to the divine law consists, then, in the exercise of supreme love to God, and that cordial good will towards men which places their interests on a level with our own.

It should be further remarked, *that that state of the affections in which any of the objects of heart-felt regard presented in the divine law are overlooked, is not obedience to God.* This is a statement of the highest importance in its bearing on the present subject. It is a statement which rests upon the Scriptures. 'Whosoever,' says the apostle James, 'shall keep the whole law, and yet offend in one point, he is guilty of all;' for, as he proceeds to show, all the divine commands rest upon the same authority; so that to live in habitual disobedience to any of these injunctions, is to set at naught the divine authority, and thus to show that the 'heart is not right with God.' That state of heart cannot be holy which, in any particular, habitually disregards the divine will.

In support of the proposition which has been announced, I observe,

I. *It is generally, perhaps universally admitted, that very estimable qualities may exist in mankind which do not imply Christian holiness.* This is evidently true of qualities merely *intellectual.* Who regards these qualities as having, in themselves, anything of a moral or religious nature? Who blames the weak and ignorant for their mental deficiencies? Who reproaches the idiot for being mindless? The wretch who could do so would bring upon himself the abhorrence of all around him. The possession of intellectual powers, in the highest degree and most polished forms, no man regards as a foundation on which *moral worth* may be justly claimed. However valuable we may regard a powerful and well disciplined mind, and large intellectual attainments, we never give them the praise of virtue. We never think of ascribing to them, in the lowest degree, any *holy* qualities. Take a poem of Burns. What beautiful forms of thought does it exhibit! What lovely images of the imagination does it present! What purity of taste and delicacy of sentiment pervades every line! And yet, alas! this very poem may be devoted to the cause of infidelity. Every attraction with which it shines may be fitted and designed to draw the reader away from God—from the

* Rom. xiii. 10. † Mat. xxii. 37.

path of duty, usefulness and peace. Whoever yields to its influence is undone! Will you admit that the intellectual qualities of Burns implied Christian benevolence? Surely not. No man, on account of the strength of his mind, and the richness of his intellectual furniture, can lay any claim to moral virtue.—On the ground of this statement, which none will deny, a *presumption* arises that *other qualities* may belong to the sensitive nature of mankind, of great use and singular beauty in their proper places, which may not necessarily partake of the nature of holiness. That this presumption looks to substantial truth, I shall now proceed to show, in the light of well known facts.

II. *Multiplied facts clearly show, that such qualities as the domestic affections, patriotic sentiments, and the feelings of humanity, exist in many men, altogether separate from Christian benevolence.*

1. The first class of facts to which I would solicit attention furnishes ground for the following general statement: The qualities just specified *often not only do not reach the most important interests of the objects toward which they are directed, but are so exercised as to injure those interests.* The unerring standard of benevolence presents *our neighbor* as an object we are bound to love as we love ourselves. But what is our neighbor? What does this plain word comprehend? Clearly, the *entire being—all* the interests of a fellow man. Strip that fellow man of a part of the attributes and interests which belong to him, and he is no longer *our neighbor*—the object which the divine command requires us to love. If we overlook his *soul*, can we have a full view of our neighbor? If our regard reaches only to his body and his temporal interests, we love only a small fragment of our neighbor. We do not love the object set before us in the law of God, but only a small and comparatively unimportant part of that object. And especially let it be considered, if our regard for this fraction of our neighbor's being leads us to injure the better part of his nature and his most valuable interests, surely this regard for him cannot be obedience to the divine will. Now this is precisely the form in which the domestic affections often appear. They only reach to the *temporal interests* of their object. For these interests the *parent* cherishes a fond regard. He is deeply anxious to promote them. For this, he spares no pains, he grudges no expense. But on the *eternal* welfare of his child—on those interests which lie beyond the grave, he refuses to expend a thought. Not a single effort does he make to secure for it the favor of God and the joys of heaven. And when that child is laid upon the bed of disease—when it is placed on the brink of eternity, the fondness of the parent becomes the deadliest injury to the child. He not only neglects himself to try to prepare it for the scenes of that world to which it is hastening, but sternly refuses to permit others to perform, in his stead, such a labor of

love! Are not such facts painfully frequent? Ask those who are conversant with dying beds, and they will give an affirmative testimony fearfully strong;—they will answer *yes*, with affecting emphasis. Is domestic affection, thus exercised, obedience to God? It clearly contains not a particle of that benevolence which the divine will, expressed in the second great commandment of the law, demands.—The same remarks may be applied, with equal truth and force, to patriotic sentiments, and the feelings of humanity. In how many instances do these most evidently reach only to the *temporal* interests of the objects which they embrace? How often are they so exercised as to injure the most valuable interests of these objects? Do those patriots who, to the extent of their influence, encourage flagrant violations of the holy Sabbath, out of regard to the temporal interests of their fellow citizens, cherish the spirit of Christian benevolence? Is it not the direct and powerful tendency of their patriotism (if patriotism it can be called,) to *injure* the highest interests of their neighbor?

2. The qualities under consideration often reach only a part of mankind.—The word neighbor, used in the second great commandment of the law, is clearly of very extensive signification. It includes every man within the circle of our acquaintance. Wherever we meet a child of Adam, we meet a neighbor. This view of the matter is fully sustained by the instructions which, on different occasions, our Saviour imparted to his followers. A Jewish lawyer once demanded of him what he should do to inherit eternal life. Our Lord referred him to the law, requiring supreme love to God, and that love to our neighbor which we cherish for ourselves, assuring him, that if he obeyed this law, he should 'live.' Upon this, the lawyer asked, 'And who is my *neighbor*.' To explain the meaning of this term, the Saviour related what has been called the story of the good Samaritan. He sets before us a traveller, evidently *a Jew*, who had fallen into the hands of 'thieves,' who had robbed him, and left him in the highway, helpless with the wounds which they had inflicted. After having been cruelly neglected by two of his own countrymen—a priest and a Levite—he was found by a *Samaritan*, who had compassion on him, and at no small expense of time, labor and money, provided for his necessities.* The conduct of this Samaritan was described with a view to answer the question of the lawyer. The good Samaritan had just views of the import of the word neighbor; for the lawyer was directed to "go and do likewise." Now let it be remembered, that between the Jews and Samaritans the most bitter enmity existed, and it will be seen that the obligations of the second great commandment bind us to regard strangers and even enemies as neighbors. In his "sermon

* Luke x. 25—37.

on the mount," too, our Lord teaches, in a very plain and impressive manner, that that affection for our fellow men which is confined to our friends, which does not reach our enemies, is worthless, and cannot receive the approbation of God.* But may not the domestic affections be exercised, when the heart is full of enmity to many of those who live beyond the limits of our families? From the Russian campaign, Napoleon returned to his palace, reeking with the blood of his enemies. His path to Moscow was strewed with murdered foes; from thence to France he was pursued by the departed spirits of his own starved, frozen army. And yet, when this destroyer of mankind had returned to his palace, to whet anew the instruments of death, his noble biographer informs us† that his "meeting" with the empress was "*extremely affectionate*, and showed, that amidst all his late losses, Napoleon *had still domestic happiness within his reach.*" In the affection which he thus expressed for his family, was there any *Christian benevolence?* any measure of obedience to the divine will? And do we not often witness instances in which persons under the influence of malice exercise the domestic affections? Do these affections, then, necessarily imply the least degree of that regard for *mankind* which places their interests on a level with our own? But nothing short of this is *holiness.* How frequently does *patriotism*, in its most striking exercises and admired forms, altogether fail of embracing the objects which the divine law requires us to love! How limited is the field in which it acts and operates! Beyond that field, how injurious is the influence it frequently exerts! And can such a sentiment be obedience to the will of him who requires us 'to love our enemies'? Surely patriotism does not necessarily imply the lowest degree of true holy affection.

3. *The qualities in question are often visible in irrational animals.*—And here the remark may deserve attention, that mankind seem to possess estimable, amiable qualities, which may belong solely to their animal nature, and to the present state of their being. This remark is sustained by the instruction which our Lord gave to some captious Sadducees, who were trying to embarrass Him with difficulties about the doctrine of the resurrection. They presented the case of a woman who had had seven husbands; and demanded, *whose wife* she should be in the resurrection? In reply to this inquiry, our Saviour assured them, that 'in the resurrection, they neither marry, nor are given in marriage; but are as the angels of God in heaven.' The domestic relations, then, are not known in the future world. And if these relations are broken up by the grave, is it not reasonable to believe that other relations, equally appropriate to the present condition of the human family, may be forever dissolved by the same means? May not those *occasions*, which generally call into exercise the

* Mat. v. 44—47. † Scott's Nap. vol. v. p. 390.

qualities under consideration, be confined to this world? And in the possession and exercise of these qualities, may we not be occupying ground in common with the irrational creation?

To this view of the subject, it is no sound objection, that these qualities *in mankind*, are united with *moral* attributes. I do not deny, that they *may be so exercised*, as to imply Christian benevolence. We may 'eat and drink to the glory of God.'* What then! In hungering and thirsting, do we not occupy ground in common with merely animal beings? And have the acts of gratifying hunger and quenching thirst *in themselves* any moral character? And to prove that such acts do not necessarily imply certain moral qualities, is it not a good and substantial argument, that they are put forth by creatures, destitute of a moral nature, and therefore incapable of moral qualities? And is it not a just conclusion, that in order to find moral qualities, good or bad, WE MUST GO BEYOND THOSE ACTS AND EXERCISES which may be ascribed to such creatures? In other words, the question, whether a man hath Christian benevolence or not, must be determined *altogether* by reference to *other* qualities, than the domestic affections and the feelings of humanity. The affections of his heart must be accordant with the law of God, or he has no holiness.

Now it is notorious, that the brute creation often exhibit, in a high degree, and in very touching forms, most of those estimable qualities of which I here speak. What a tender and lively regard for their helpless young do they manifest! What deep pity for objects in distress do they sometimes feel! With what a generous attachment to their owners do they often appear to be moved! What uncorrupt fidelity in guarding the trust committed to them do they sometimes maintain! In witnessing these qualities in them, men are affected much in the same way, as by seeing them in their own species. I have been struck with a remark, which is said to have fallen from the lips of a distinguished military officer. Walking forth upon the field of battle, in the evening of a day of bloody conflict, he saw a dog leap from the cloak of his dead master, with a piteous howl. An appeal equally thrilling to the sympathies of his heart, he declared, he had never felt before.—Our Saviour did not hesitate to illustrate his tender regard for the people of Jerusalem, by the lively and strong attachment of a hen for her young. Yet no one, I suppose, ascribes Christian benevolence—holiness of heart, to any of the irrational animals. The qualities, then, which mankind have in common with them, do not *necessarily* imply the least degree of holiness.

4. The qualities in question may often be *fairly traced to other motives* than obedience to the divine will.—Look at yonder father. How fondly he caresses the children, whom he affectionately calls his own! How promptly he resents whatever ill treatment they may receive! With what energy he nerves his arm

* 1 Cor. x. 31.

to defend their rights—to cripple the hand that is stretched out to harm them! And yet this very father, so fond and affectionate, stubbornly refuses to sacrifice, for their benefit, the loathsome habit of drinking intoxicating liquor! So far from this, he eagerly and resolutely sacrifices their best interests, their highest happiness, to the gratification, on his part, of a most unnatural and ruinous propensity. Does his affectionate regard for his children necessarily imply any measure of obedience to the commands of God? Does he cherish, even toward his children, the spirit of Christian benevolence?

Any one may see, that numerous motives, besides obedience to God, may lead men to cherish and maintain such qualities as *veracity* and *honesty*. May not a shrewd and observant worldling have discovered the soundness of the maxim, that *honesty is the best policy*? And may he not, from mere worldly motives, from a regard to his present interests and reputation, act upon this maxim? Veracity and honesty he may find among the most effectual means of increasing his wealth, and brightening his fame. And while such motives *may* produce such qualities, do not multiplied facts clearly show, that these qualities are often the *actual result* of motives such as have been mentioned? How frequently, when by any means *reputation is lost*, do men cease to be honest and veracious! A very slight temptation will draw them aside from the path of rectitude.—Now, if these qualities may, and often must, be traced to other motives than obedience to the divine will, a child can see that they do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence.

5. The qualities under consideration often exist in mankind *separate from each other, and from other qualities, which are clearly essential to holiness*.—It is a striking remark of Dr. Paley, that "when our duties are recited" in the New Testament, "they are put *collectively*, that is, as all and every of them required in the *Christian character*." And if we mark the bearing of express statements in the sacred volume, it will appear, with the greatest clearness, that where some features of the Christian character are wanting in any given case, no holiness exists. In the passage already quoted from the epistle of James, we are taught, that true obedience embraces *all* the divine commands; that he, who refuses to obey any one of the requisitions of the law, whatever in other respects he may seem to be, has no cordial regard to the will of God. He cannot, then, have any Christian benevolence.

In the epistle to the Hebrews, we are taught, that "Without *faith*, it is impossible to please God."* Here then, we have one trait of Christian character, so essential, that without it, that character cannot be formed. Whatever valuable and amiable qualities a person may exhibit, he cannot secure the divine approbation

* Heb. xi. 6.

without *faith*. Moral worth—Christian benevolence, then, cannot exist without faith; for did they thus exist, they would certainly secure the divine approbation. Every kind and degree of moral goodness must awaken the complacency and draw forth the smiles of our heavenly Father. Hence, if His smiles are not bestowed—if His complacency is not awakened, the conclusion is inevitable, that no moral beauty is presented to His eye. But who will deny that, in multiplied instances, the amiable qualities under consideration have been exhibited by men devoid of Christian faith? Have not the most determined infidels—have not avowed atheists, often been distinguished for the exercise of the domestic affections? Have they not expressed, in attractive forms, the sentiments of humanity and of patriotism? Have they not sometimes been remarkable for honesty and veracity, in their intercourse with those around them? At the same time, they scorned and opposed the Christian religion. They trode upon the record of its truths. They reviled and persecuted its cordial and devoted adherents. They had *no faith* in the Christian revelation. Hence we have divine authority for the conclusion, that God withheld from them His approving smiles. They had no moral worth. Surely, then, the possession of such qualities as they exhibited, does not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence.

Let the facts, which have been given under the above particulars be now placed together; and how firm and broad a foundation do they lay for the doctrine under consideration. The qualities in hand often not only do not reach the most important interests of the object toward which they are directed, but are so exercised as to injure those interests; they reach only a part of mankind; are visible in irrational animals; may be fairly traced, in many instances, to other motives besides obedience to God; and often exist in mankind separate from each other, and from other qualities, which are clearly essential to holiness.

III. *The doctrine in question derives the firmest support from the sacred Scriptures.* The Apostle Paul presents a supposition, which bears with great clearness and force upon the point in hand. "*Though I bestow all my goods to feed the poor, and have not charity*, it profiteth me nothing."* This statement of the Apostle could have no force—it would not be intelligible, if the feelings of humanity, and kindred qualities, necessarily implied any degree of holiness. In immediate connection, the Apostle has given at considerable length, a description of that charity, which is essential to moral goodness. Upon a single feature of this description, it may be proper to insist. "*Charity rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth.*" Here the word *truth*, is used in direct opposition to the word *iniquity;* as in some other connec-

* 1 Cor. xiii. 3.

tions, it means *virtue* or *piety*—a state of mind, and a course of life, conformed to the divine requirements.* But how often do those, who rejoice in iniquity and loathe the truth, exhibit, in a striking manner, the domestic affections, patriotic sentiments, and the feelings of humanity! The sailor at his cups hears the cry of distress. His compassion is awakened. He rushes to the water's edge, and sees a child struggling with agony, in the angry surge. With a horrid oath upon his lips, he plunges into the water; and, at the hazard of his own life, rescues that of the little sufferer. Who is not moved with admiration at such an exhibition of the feelings of humanity! How deep and strong the tide of compassion which gushed from the sailor's heart! And yet that sailor was a drunkard—was profane. Had he aught of that charity which rejoiceth not in iniquity, but rejoiceth in the truth?—How often have those, who had been greatly distinguished for the warmth and strength of their *patriotic feelings*, been notorious for "rejoicing in iniquity." How often have they not only "cast off fear and restrained prayer," but indulged themselves in open, shameful vices! How often have they been notorious for sabbath-breaking and profaneness! With what eagerness have they sometimes plunged into the most loathsome excesses of dissipation and debauchery! And will it be said in behalf of such men, that they "rejoice not in iniquity, but rejoice in the truth?" Surely not. Then we have the decision of the Apostle Paul, that however they may be distinguished for their patriotism, (so called) they are devoid of charity—of that benevolence, without which holiness cannot exist.

There are few passages of the New Testament, more familiar than the story of *the amiable young ruler*. He was so truly amiable, as to attract the *love* of Jesus. It is clear from the connection, that this love was awakened by the interesting qualities which the young ruler exhibited. But whether these qualities had any moral worth or involved any holiness, clearly appears from the sad conclusion of the story. "One thing," said the Saviour, "thou lackest; go thy way, sell whatsoever thou hast, and give to the poor, and thou shalt have treasure in heaven; and come, take up the cross, and follow me." This direction was well fitted to try his character. It required him to evince, by substantial proofs, that he loved "God with all his heart and his neighbor as himself." Such a regard for God and his neighbor would certainly have insured obedience. A refusal to obey would clearly prove, that he was destitute of that benevolence in which holiness consists. But did he not refuse to obey? Hear the evangelist. "And he was sad at that saying, and went away grieved: for he had great possessions." Will it be denied, that this young man loved his wealth more than God? He actually gave up the offered favor of God for the sake of keeping his possessions. With his eyes fully open to the consequences of such a choice,

* See Rom. ii. 8.

he preferred the service of mammon to the service of Jehovah. Now the voice of inspired Wisdom has expressly assured us, "that if any man love the world, the love of the Father *is not in him.*" Did not this young man love the world—regard it as the supreme good—make it the portion of his soul? *Amiable*, he certainly was; but it is as certain, that he was devoid of Christian benevolence. Not a spark of holiness warmed his bosom. It was frozen by selfishness and worldliness.

Such are the arguments and illustrations, which support the doctrine laid down at the commencement of this discussion. If I do not entirely misapprehend their import and bearing, they clearly and decidedly prove, that the qualities under consideration, and kindred attributes, do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence.

In review of the train of thought which has been presented, I observe,

1. That if the qualities, just examined, do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence, *then their existence in human character is no just objection to the doctrine, that men by nature are wholly sinful.*—These qualities, as has been shown, do not imply any measure of holiness. In whatever form they appear, they do not meet and fulfil the demands of the divine law. What, then, if they *do* exist in human character? Can qualities, which have in themselves no moral excellence, *impart* moral excellence to the character to which they belong? How can this be? How can that be *imparted*, which is not *possessed?* Now if the qualities in question have no moral excellence in themselves, as has been proved, and can impart no moral excellence to the subject to which they belong; what just objection can be drawn from the union of these qualities with human character, to the entire sinfulness of mankind? When a quality in the native character of man can be found, which necessarily implies any degree of holiness, then, and not till then, a substantial objection to the doctrine of man's entire depravity by nature is discovered. But nothing of this can be said of any of the qualities which belong to the native character of man.—With what propriety and truth, then, are the amiable and estimable properties of mankind—such as have been dwelt upon in this paper, urged as an objection to the doctrine, that all men by nature are wholly sinful? With equal propriety might the advocates of the native innocence of the human family point us to the athletic frames; or fine forms; or beautiful countenances; or vigorous and well furnished intellects of some of their acquaintances, as proofs, clear and decisive, that they were not altogether sinful!* You would think it a slight proof,

* An argument such as this has actually been urged. After speaking of "the godlike capacities of human nature," Dr. Channing says, "I may be told that I dream, and that I have peopled the world with creatures of my lonely imagination. What! Is it only in dreams that BEAUTY AND LOVELINESS HAVE BEAMED ON ME FROM THE HUMAN

indeed, that any one has a *powerful mind*, because he has the *frame* and the *strength* of a giant. And for this plain and sufficient reason, that such physical qualities, however valuable, do not necessarily imply intellectual strength and excellence. Equally slight, is the proof, that mankind have any *moral excellence*, because they exercise the feelings of humanity; cherish the domestic affections; or maintain in themselves what are commonly called patriotic sentiments. And for the plain and sufficient reason, that such qualities as these do not necessarily imply the least degree of Christian benevolence. Objections, like that here examined, leave the doctrine of the unrenewed man's entire depravity where they found it;—*supported by the strongest testimonies of God's unerring word.*

2. *Those who deny that the qualities which have been considered have any moral worth, may, nevertheless, justly admire and reward them.*—"How early," exclaims a distinguished Unitarian,* "does the infant discover affection, attachment, gratitude, to those from whom it receives kindness! How universally is it an object of interest to those about it!—Instead of this, must it not (on the supposition of the truth of the Orthodox doctrine of depravity,) naturally be the object of aversion and disgust, and especially so to pious and virtuous persons?" To such inquiries, from whatever quarter they may come, and with whatever assurance they may be urged, a short answer is at hand. I say, then, that the infant, with the interesting qualities ascribed to it, need not, ought not, to be "the object of aversion and disgust to pious persons," however orthodox they may be. Had the Saviour been surrounded by all his orthodox disciples in New England, when he beheld with affectionate regard the amiable young ruler, who yet lacked the one thing needful, they might, in the strictest consistency with their religious principles, have admired whatever was estimable, and loved whatever was amiable in his character. What child does not know that an object may be justly admirable in one point of view, and justly loathsome and disgusting in another? May I not admire the exquisite skill and taste displayed in the structure of a pagan temple, while I abhor the design for which that structure was erected? May not very fine specimens of good writing be found on the pages of Paine and Hume? May I not justly admire these specimens? In one point of view, I may well call them *good* writers; in another, very *bad* writers. May not the most thorough Calvinist admire the vigorous intellect, large attainments, and correct taste of his friends, while at the same time he regards *them* as wholly sinful? Why, according to

COUNTENANCE; that I have heard *tones of kindness which have thrilled through my heart;* that I have found *sympathy in sufferings*, and a *sacred joy in friendship?*" "Oh no! I do not dream, when I speak of the Divine capacities of human nature." Sermon at Providence, p. 27. Cogent arguments these, to disprove the Divine testimony, that "the hearts of the sons of men are *fully set in them to do evil.*"

* Dr. Ware.

the representations of some writers, who have a high reputation for strength, acuteness, extent of information, and candor, I should suppose that the "Orthodox doctrine of depravity" implied that unrenewed men were idiots or brute beasts; nay, that rottenness had entered into their very bones! But all such representations, come from what quarter they may, are abusive falsehoods. The qualities which Dr. Ware ascribes to infants and unrenewed men, the Orthodox regard, on the most substantial grounds, as entirely distinct from holiness. They may, and they *do*, admire them, as estimable and amiable properties; but they may not, they do not, ascribe to them any *moral* worth. Moral worth, in themselves, they have none. They do not necessarily imply the smallest degree of Christian benevolence. It is a poor, stale *slander* on "the Orthodox doctrine of depravity," of which the adversaries of that doctrine ought to be ashamed, that it requires those who embrace it to regard with aversion and disgust such qualities in the human character as *have in themselves no moral properties.* Let this slander cease to be repeated. It may excite a popular odium against the truth. It may prevent, in dying sinners, a deep conviction of their guilt. It may hold them back from the cross of Christ. But those concerned in the circulation of such a slander may determine for themselves what good can come of it, to themselves, or to those who are under their influence.

3. *The possession of the qualities considered in this paper is no fair proof of Christian character.*—I know the man of whom you speak was much distinguished for his integrity, his amiableness, his public spirit. But what proof had those, who soothed his fears of the wrath of God upon his dying bed, that he was a disciple of Jesus Christ? No other proof, alas! than what was furnished in the interesting qualities just enumerated. They ought not, then, *surely they ought not*, on such grounds, to have soothed those fears, which might have led him to the Saviour's feet. How could they see him perish in his sins, under a strange presumption that his amiable and estimable qualities would secure for him the smiles of Heaven! To higher ground than this must sinners rise, to reach the sunny region where a gracious God dispenses the smiles of his unveiled countenance. Amiable, upright, nerved by the feelings of humanity and a public spirit, we shall indeed be, if *we are Christians.* But without *higher* qualities than these, we certainly cannot be the disciples of the Saviour. We might as well hope to be admitted to the joys of the upper world on the ground of a vigorous intellect and a refined taste, as on the ground of our amiableness and integrity, our humane feelings and patriotic sentiments. Let all beware of building their house on such a sandy foundation. The storm will sweep it away. Let all hasten to that Rock which God has laid in Zion, humble themselves at the feet of the Redeemer, and hang their hopes of everlasting life upon the CROSS.